

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Please amend the drawings, as shown in the accompanying replacement sheets in which Figs. 2-3 are legible.

REMARKS

Replacement sheets for Figs. 2-3 accompany this communication to satisfy the illegible drawing objection.

Claims 22, 26, 35 and 37-42 have been amended to satisfy the indefiniteness objections raised by the Examiner and to provide clearer antecedent basis for all terms used.

Each independent claim 22 and 40-42 has been amended by adding the limitations of now-canceled claim 27. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Examiner's opinion that the features of claim 27 are disclosed by Prolux.

Table 6 of Prolux discloses that some of the fields have default values. However, Prolux *fails* to disclose that these default values are determined by a computer program product in response to a user entering data into one of editable fields in creating a Route Object.

Claim 27 requires that at least one default value is determined in response to a user entering data into an editable field. Table 6 discloses an example of fields and their default values for a new IP link form, but these default values are *not* affected in any way by what a user specifies in an editable field. If a user wants to create a new IP link, then Table 6 lists the default values that the user will have to start with. Indeed, as described in the last sentence of paragraph 0058, Prolux discloses: *"By default, the general configuration tab panel is displayed when the IP link configuration form is opened."*

It is also important to note that claim 27 requires that the default setting is determined for a subsequent editable field. This means that at least two editable fields are presented to the user in a sequence where the contents of the latter field takes on a default value determined by the

computer program product based on the contents entered by the user in the former field. This feature is *not* disclosed by Prolux.

Claim 27 is not anticipated by Ahearn or White either. In consequence, any combination of the prior art relied upon by the Examiner would not result in a solution as defined in claim 27.

Wherefore, a favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KIRSCHSTEIN, ISRAEL, SCHIFFMILLER & PIERONI, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)
425 Fifth Avenue, 5th Floor
New York, New York 10016-2223
Tel: (212) 697-3750
Fax: (212) 949-1690

/Alan ISRAEL/

Alan Israel
Reg. No. 27,564